

385

W6la

pan

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 062004848

Additional Burdens upon Street Railway Companies.

ADDRESSES

BY

HENRY M. WHITNEY, ESQ.

BEFORE THE

Central Club, Somerville, April 30, 1891, and the Roxbury
Club, Boston, May 9, 1891.

BOSTON:
PRESS OF SAMUEL USHER,
171 DEVONSHIRE STREET.
1891.

385

gW61a

YR0000
11 11 11

ADDRESS BEFORE THE CENTRAL CLUB, SOMERVILLE

APRIL 30, 1891.

MR. PRESIDENT, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE CITY OF
SOMERVILLE:—

I am very glad of the opportunity of meeting with the people of Somerville, or of any other section of the suburbs of Boston with which the West End Street Railway has connection, because the subject of transportation is one of the most important subjects with which the community is concerned, and I think I may say that it is a subject about which as little is understood as almost any other subject that the community discusses.

I had occasion last year, in view of certain comparisons that I knew would be made before the present Legislature of the system of transportation in the State of Massachusetts with the systems of transportation in other States, and especially in foreign countries, to make a very careful investigation of the transportation question in other cities and in other countries in comparison with the transportation system in use here; and I found so closely connected was the question of transportation with the social life of the community that I became exceedingly interested in the manner of life of foreign peoples as bearing upon this question of transportation. I have never been across the water, and all that I know of the transportation system in Europe or of the social life of these cities I have gained from an examination of the statistics furnished me by the people whom I have sent to investigate the subject and the papers that I have had sent to me since.

The system of transportation in Berlin has often been referred to as a system very desirable to have established here, and it was in view of that fact that I gave to the subject of transportation and social life in Berlin the most careful study. Now, the social life in Berlin is so entirely

different from the social life of which the city of Somerville knows anything as to be almost beyond belief. I found by reference to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* that in 1872 there were 55 persons to every house in the city of Berlin. Now, I find that by the last census in the city of Somerville the number of people to a house in Somerville was 5.90. Following the same tendency, I was sure, that had been observed from 1861 to 1872, the number of people under one roof in Berlin has grown to the number of 66. Now, there are in the whole city of Berlin but 26,800 dwelling-houses, with a population of 1,315,000 people. There are absolutely but one half as many dwellings in the city of Berlin as there are in the city of Boston with one third of its population. There is absolutely no such thing in Berlin, or Hamburg, or Munich, or Leipsic, or Frankfort, or any of those German cities, as suburbs. The people live in these tenement-houses and in cellars and in garrets, herded together in the most distressing manner.

At the time I spoke before the Committee on Cities of the Legislature I was unable to find any statistics which would throw any light upon the subject later than those contained in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, which brought them down to 1872; but only last week a friend of mine, who was in Washington, brought me one of the reports from the consuls of the United States. It is Consular Document No. 98, issued in October, 1888, and contains in the last part of the volume some exceedingly interesting translations from distinguished Germans upon the homes of the German working people; and I hope I shall not weary you by reading from this paper some of the facts connected with the social life of Berlin and other cities.

Here is an article — these are all translations from German papers — translated by James Henry Smith, United States consular agent at Mayence: "The tenement, or flat, system of dwelling prevails in Germany, and a whole house occupied by but a single family is a rarity." Now, in the great city of Berlin of 1,315,000 inhabitants, in 1885 there were but 2,820 private houses, and in the city of Somerville

there are almost 7,000; and in the city of Leipsic, a city of almost 150,000 inhabitants, there were of private houses only 148. "This naturally leads to an overfilling of houses, and in the large cities to the massing of the lower classes in the old tenements as they become abandoned by the people of means for newer structures. In time this herding together, as the buildings become even more rickety, gets to be a public evil. They are let and sublet until they become perfectly packed with tenants and subtenants, and through overcrowding, uncleanness, bad drainage, and lack of ventilation, they become, in a place like Berlin, for instance, perfect pest-holes and generators of all kinds of disease and infirmity."

There were of underground, or cellar, tenements in the city of Berlin, in 1880, 23,289, and in those cellar tenements lived a population of 100,827. There were of garret tenements 10,416, and there lived in those garret tenements 39,019 people—almost as many people as in this city of Somerville dwelt in the city of Berlin in garret tenements.

That overcrowding of tenements in general is evident from this, that in Berlin in 1880, out of a population of 1,122,330, there were 478,052 persons living in tenements of but one room that could be heated, or an average of 3.75 inmates to a room; 302,322 living in tenements possessing but two rooms that could be heated, or an average of 2.23 to a room, and 127,346 in tenements with three rooms that could be heated, or an average of 1.56 to a room. There were thus 907,720 inhabitants of Berlin, out of a population of 1,122,330, or more than three fourths of the entire number of people, dwelling in tenements having not more than three rooms that could be heated, and having on an average 2.51 inmates to a room. In some of the other cities it was even worse than this. For Leipsic in 1880 the figures were even higher than for Breslau, being 3.84, 2.53, and 1.80 persons in a room in the three categories respectively; and Breslau was higher than Berlin, being 3.84 to a room. "Only 29,323 of the large population of Berlin lived in tenements having eight or more rooms to a tenement; only 3,550 in Breslau in such tenements, out of the population of 272,000."

I have referred to these cellar tenements. It is astonishing how people can live in such places. These are all below the street. Thirteen and three-tenths per cent. of them were less than 3.28 feet below the outside sidewalk; 38 per cent. were four to five feet below the sidewalk; 10 per cent. were five to five and a half feet below, and 5.9 per cent. were five and a half to six and a half feet below the sidewalk. The people often do their work there, and they sleep there and they live there.

Now, how do the rents compare? How do the rents in this great city of Berlin, in these miserable tenements, compare with the rent or the cost of a small house, or with the cost of the larger number of houses in the city of Boston, and possibly in the city of Somerville? There were, in 1890, in the city of Boston, something over 50,000 houses, according to the estimate of the assessors of Boston given in the auditor's report. I hold in my hand the report of the year 1889-90. The number of dwelling-houses, exclusive of hotels and family hotels, in the city of Boston for that year was 49,716, and the number of houses of the value of \$3,000 and less was 21,846. Take the cost of these houses and estimate them at 5 per cent. Of course the interest on the cost of a house is \$150, and the taxes, say \$50, making the whole \$200, varying with the cost of the house. Now, the cost of these tenements in the city of Berlin varies as follows: in the cellar tenements in 1875 the rent of a cellar tenement was \$111 for a single tenement, the ground floor was \$234, the second story \$216, and the garret \$70.

So far as I am able to judge, the cost of one of these tenements in the city of Berlin is almost as much as the cost of the largest proportion, or one half at least, of the houses in and about the city of Boston. The fact is that in the city of Boston, and I dare say it must be so in the city of Somerville, the cost to the people of Somerville of a whole house is not much more, upon the average, than the cost of a single tenement in the city of Berlin. Well, now, these people are obliged to live so, in the first place, because their income does not permit them to live in any other way in the

city of Berlin. It comes back to that in the end—the income of these people. It varies from twenty-five to seventy-five cents a day. In one of these papers is given a list of the weekly wages of 1885, a list of wages that are received by people in the different trades. The weekly wages, for instance, at Leipsic, in the general trades, are given at the following figures per week. These are all translations from German papers and I assume they are correct: blacksmith, 11 hours per day, \$4.28 to \$5.47 per week; coopers, \$4.04 to \$4.09; masons, 11 hours per day, \$4.88 to \$6.20 per week; saddlers, \$3.57 to \$4.99; hodcarriers, 11 hours per day, \$2.38 to \$3.57 per week. Now, that is a specimen. Those are the facts connected with the social life of the people of Berlin, and substantially of every city throughout Germany, so far as I have been able to ascertain by careful observation of these statistics.

Now, the social life of these communities in Massachusetts and these United States is so entirely different as to be almost incomprehensible. I procured from the bureau of statistics a sheet showing certain statistics relating to the social life and population of the cities and towns in the State of Massachusetts for the last census, and I found, as I stated before, that in 1890 the number of persons to a house in the city of Somerville was 5.90, and I found that it had absolutely fallen—that while in 1880, the time of taking the last census, it was reported at 6.07, in 1890 the number of persons to a dwelling had fallen to 5.90, showing that there had been an increase in the dwellings among the poorer classes, and that there was absolutely a less number of people in a house, on the average, than there was ten years ago. Finding this proportion was so small, I was curious to see how this compared with the number of people living in the agricultural communities. I was unable to get the complete census for 1890, but the census for 1880, which I happened to have in my library, is as follows: in the State of Illinois the number of persons to a dwelling is 5.72; in Indiana, 5.47; Ohio, 5.45; in Pennsylvania, 5.73; in Kentucky, 5.87. Well, now, that is a most astonishing record to me, that in the city

of Somerville, of 40,000 inhabitants, within five miles of a great city, the people of this city should be able to live in such a manner as this, and that the life in this community is so nearly the life that is led by these agricultural communities as these statistics show it to be. I found that in the city of Boston in 1880 the number of persons to a dwelling was 8.26, while it had increased in the last ten years to 9.82. In Cambridge it was 6.38 in 1880, and 6.58 in 1890. The cities of Lowell and Lawrence, large manufacturing centres, are places where you might expect to find the people crowded into tenements, if you would expect it anywhere in the State of Massachusetts, but even in the city of Lowell there were only 6.86 people to a dwelling, and in the city of Lawrence 7.70.

Now, does the system of transportation in the city of Berlin have any bearing on this question? I think it does. The system in the city of Berlin is simply this: they go a certain distance for a single fare, and the maximum distance in the city of Berlin—and it is farther in the city of Berlin than any other German city whose statistics I have investigated—is a mile and a half. You can go a mile and a half for $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents, but when you cross that mile and a half—it makes no difference whether you go 100 yards this side or 100 yards the other side—you are obliged to pay two fares if you go beyond that limit, and a single fare is 10 pfennigs, which is $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents. You can ride one and a half miles in Berlin cheaper than you can in Boston, but if you want to ride two miles it is just the same as if you were to ride three, three and a half, or four miles. The maximum distance at which these stations are apart is one and a half miles, and they vary from that to eighty-four one-hundredths of a mile.

Now, you will see that the payment of $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents twice a day, going back and forth every day, for a man who receives only from 25 to 75 cents a day for his labor, is a much larger proportion of his daily earnings than the sum that is paid in the city of Boston, and it is impossible for these laboring people to pay, with the income that they receive, even the

fare of $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents for the purpose of getting out of this particular district, and the same thing has operated in Berlin as would be absolutely sure to follow here if the fare were so high that the people could not go into the suburbs and avail themselves of the opportunities to get cheap houses and cheap lands, where they can build better, healthier homes.

Now, the system of Berlin is two cents and a half for every mile and a half. That system, if applied here (our road could be operated at the cost of the roads in Berlin), would have brought to the West End road a net income of nearly three millions of dollars more than it received. There are 16,000 acres of land in Berlin, and less than 8,000 acres are occupied. These 28,000 buildings, holding 1,315,000 people, occupy less than one half of the building land in the city of Berlin. Now, there is an elevated railroad in the city of Berlin, built at a cost of nearly \$20,000,000. It is almost 20 miles long, and the best elevated railroad that there is in the wide world, and it carried last year 15,000,000 people and earned less than 4 per cent., in the aggregate, of its cost. It was started by private capitalists, and so expensive was it that it was abandoned and was finished by the government, and is owned by the government, and the same system of fares holds there, excepting that there is no fare less than five cents, and it goes from that to ten cents. In that great city of four times the population of the city of Boston there were only 15,000,000 people carried in 1890 on that elevated railroad, and the West End Street Railway Company carried on its surface system last year 114,000,000. Now, what would the West End Railroad Company, or what would these communities do, with an elevated railroad like that in the the city of Berlin? Why, they would simply connect it with their outlying lines, and give the people the opportunity of going back and forth over these surface lines and over the elevated lines, and doing it for one fare if possible. See what the effect would be upon the social life of these communities!

What is the system of transportation in the city of Boston? Do we discriminate against the suburbs? Not at all.

Isn't it a system that is calculated to send people to the suburbs because we make no greater charge for a person coming from Somerville than if he got into the cars at Causeway Street and rode to State Street? I agree that there seems to be some measure of injustice in that. I agree that, perhaps, we ought not to charge quite so much for a half-mile as for five miles, but I say that I believe that it is entirely due to this system that this condition of social life exists to which I have called attention. I believe that if you draw a line, a mile line, or a two-mile line, or a two-and-a-half-mile line, and say, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther, for a single fare," then you compel large numbers of people to dwell within that distance; and there is some compensation — I say there is a large compensation — to the people that live within the narrow circle in the fact that some people will go farther within that inner circle, which is less crowded in consequence of it. They are willing to spend longer time in the cars, they are willing to be subjected to the discomfort of a longer ride and a crowded car, for the purpose of living in these cheaper and healthier places, and, in that way, it reacts upon the social life of the people within the narrow circle, and I have come to the conclusion that that is some compensation.

Coming down now to the substantial transportation between the city of Somerville and the city of Boston, I want to call your attention to the fact that from Central Street in this city of Somerville, I believe from this corner here, which is somewhat near the centre of Somerville, to Boylston Street in Boston, it is about $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles. In fact, the cars run something farther than this point — it would be fair to say that the cars for the city of Somerville, about five miles each way, taking the distance to Boylston Street or Temple Place from near the centre of Somerville. We run the cars also beyond Boylston Street, so that Somerville people have the opportunity to go beyond in this direction and further than Boylston Street in the other. Now, what does it cost to run a car? There are a great many people who have an idea that cars can be run and give everybody a seat.

Well, now, it cost last year, the fiscal year ending October, 1890, including our taxes, a little more than 26 cents a mile to run a car. This year, owing to the increase in the cost of grain, the cost is nearly 28 cents. That is made up of about 12 cents a mile, while it cost us to feed the horses and pay for their depreciation, their harnesses, and one thing and another that comes into the cost of the motive power. It costs between 8 and 9 cents for conductors and drivers. That is absolute money paid out, and that is about 20 cents a mile, and it costs for repairs of the cars, repairs of our tracks and stables, and all general expenses and our taxes, from 6 to 8 cents. That gives nothing at all as a dividend for the capital invested. Now, in order to earn 6 per cent. upon the money that is invested to do this business, it costs about 6 cents a mile on the cost, making about 34 cents a mile as the cost. I presume that nobody here will consider that 6 per cent. or even 7 or 8 or 10 per cent. was an extravagant sum to be allowed to the capital furnishing all this transportation, and taking care of it, and everything of that kind. Well, now, what does that mean? That means that the cost of running a car to and from the city of Boston, which is 10 miles, is \$3.40. That further means that if each one of these passengers pays 5 cents, you must get 68 passengers on the round trip in order to pay your expenses and to pay your 6 per cent., and that means 34 passengers in the car each way, and that means not only 34 passengers in each car each way, but it means that for every trip that is run too; and if you do not get the 34 passengers each way for every trip that is run, you must make it up by getting more passengers into some of the cars, and that, I assume, is what is done. (Laughter.) But, unfortunately for us, we did not get our 34 cents from the city of Somerville, notwithstanding the fact that the city of Charlestown and its shorter haul was on this line, and notwithstanding that the people that get into the cars at the northern depots, going up town, are credited to the city of Somerville — notwithstanding all that, for last year the earning of the Charlestown line, of this whole division, the shorter haul and all

was about 31 cents. That was all there was of it, and many of these Somerville lines do not pay. I say this in no offensive sense at all, but simply that you may appreciate the real facts of the situation, and then I am going to tell you what the remedy is. The first thing is that you should appreciate and understand the real facts of the situation, and these figures that I have here are not any figures that were made up for presentation to this Association; they are the reports that are made by our treasurer and auditor, and when they were made they had not the slightest knowledge, and neither had I, that they ever would be used for any such purpose; they are simply our business statistics for the year.

There is one line that we run in the city of Somerville called "the Highland-avenue transfer line." We ran 22,447 miles last year, and we received the enormous sum of \$827.01 — that one cent is very important — or an average of three and seven-tenths cents per mile for that Highland-avenue transfer line. It cost us to run those 22,447 miles \$6,000, and there was loss on that Highland-avenue transfer line of \$5,000. There are people who believe that we can carry people and give them a seat all the way from Somerville to Boston, and for a single fare of five cents. If we carried an absolute car full we should earn, with twenty-two seats, \$1.10, and the absolute cost would be \$1.40, and nobody can do it cheaper than that.

Well, now, what is the remedy? Is there any remedy for it? There is but one practical remedy, for I believe that the city of Somerville, the people who ride, would be unwilling to consent to an increase in the fares, and I am certain that we cannot buy our material at less, and I do not believe that the men that we employ will consent to any reduction in their wages; therefore, those two alternatives are impracticable, and there is but one other that I know of, and that is by the introduction of a cheaper system of motive power. There is a system of motive power which two years ago was in the experimental stage, and which the West End Railway Company has been introducing ever since, and I am happy to say that the expectations indulged in at that time have

been more than realized ; but when I look back upon it, and see what we have done or what we undertook to do two years ago, it looks almost like recklessness. I do not mean to be understood that up to this time we have realized any very great degree of saving, for the thing is in its early, incipient stage, but we are building power-houses which shall provide power at the cheapest possible cost. Great improvements are being made in the machinery, and along with this we have been able to use a much larger car. We are able with this power to run a car which shall seat thirty-six passengers at less than the cost of seating twenty-two, and that is what you are interested in having done. If we could run a car seating thirty-six passengers at the same cost as that of a car that seats twenty-two passengers, and we could fill it every time, we could afford to give everybody in Somerville who rides back and forth a seat, and have some money ourselves. Now, that is the system that the city of Somerville is interested in having adopted, and having adopted at the earliest possible moment ; but this thing cannot be done without money. Now, the money that goes into this transportation business, in my judgment, should be made as secure as possible and it ought to be made a favorite investment, for I believe that there is no money spent in the community, and none given away for any charitable purpose whatsoever, that does any more good than that invested in this transportation business, and if the city of Somerville realizes its own interests in this respect, it will stand by the West End Railway Company in what it is undertaking to do, and coöperate with it in its efforts. (Applause.)

We have been called before the Legislature this year with such attacks upon our property, upon our rights, as to be absolutely destructive of any further investments in this business if the attacks should be successful ; no man can do it, and no set of men, can. I cannot work out this problem for this or any other community unless it be understood implicitly that the money that is invested in this business shall be secured. So far as the taxation question is concerned, although I have differed with your city of Somer-

ville, or some of the aldermen of the city of Somerville, in this respect, I know that it was because the city of Somerville did not understand this question. It would be decidedly better for Somerville to relieve the railroad of every cent of tax, if thereby it could promote and encourage and develop this system of transportation, which is so important to this community.

Now, the city of Somerville is a city of very rapid growth. I congratulate you and every citizen of Somerville on your magnificent showing for the last twenty years, and especially for the last five years. The growth is something perfectly astonishing. It is paralleled only by the suburbs surrounding Boston — West Roxbury and Brighton and Everett — and it compares with the cities of the West and South. But along with this growth, and as a very important, if not the most important, factor in the growth and prosperity or comfort of the people that are to occupy these homes in the future, is the question of how they shall get back and forth to and from their business. We live in a most surprising age. When I see the very great difference between the wages paid abroad and the wages paid at home, I wonder if this condition of things can continue. I know that the fare between the city of Somerville and the city of Boston to most of you gentlemen here is of very small consequence. I know that very many of you would be perfectly willing to pay ten cents for a seat in and out of Boston, if thereby you could get it and if it were possible to arrange a system of transportation which should give the people who are willing to pay this ten cents back and forth a class of cars by which it could be done. I know that would be very satisfactory to great numbers of your people. But that is impossible: I apprehend that the day may come when the difference between five cents and ten cents will be a very great factor in determining the question where people shall live.

Now, then, how can we improve this system? How can we shorten the time without increasing the cost? That is the next problem with which we and this community have to deal. I have, personally, no desire for anything that I can

make out of the elevated road or the underground road, to undertake it. The pecuniary compensations have not the slightest temptations for me, because it is such a tremendous question, so full of possibilities, it is true, but so full of dangers to any concern that undertakes it, I am free to say to you that I shrink from the task. I know there are plenty of men who will come into your hall to-day, or will go to the legislative hall, who will tell you that if you will give them a charter they will build the elevated or underground railroad for you, but it is perfect nonsense to listen to any such talk as that. The granting of any charter to anybody at this time would simply be an embarrassment of the whole question, for this is a question that will task the utmost capacity, in my judgment, of this community and Cambridge and Boston and all the communities that desire to see this thing done. I desire to see it done, because, seeing how the people live abroad, and seeing how important it is that the people shall continue to go to the suburbs, in order that they may live in this healthy way, I say that there is no question of equal importance which confronts these communities. I shall do what I can to point out the proper way, but if any other man or set of men are willing to undertake the solution of that problem, and will build that underground or elevated road, and will give us at each end of that line a connection which will permit us to carry you to your homes and the people on the other side of the city of Boston to their homes, I shall be very glad of it. I believe that it will require some aid, some relief from taxation, instead of added taxation, in order that the thing may be done, and I hope this Association will give to that question, when it comes up, careful consideration.

I have not the slightest idea what will be proposed, but I tell you that if the thing is done at all, it will have to be done in a way which the people little expect at this time, for, unless I am mistaken, there is a very general belief that there is money in the enterprise. Well, I do not believe that there is; but still I think — I know — it ought to be done. I know that there ought to be found some way by which, say

from Thompson Square to Roxbury Postoffice, there shall be, before many years, some new and improved means of transit, accommodating the dwellers within that section, and through the surface roads reaching the people beyond the termini.

This transportation question is a question that merits the careful consideration of your people. You have reached the limit of accommodation by horsecars. Neither the West End Railway Company, nor any other corporation, nor any other parties, can do anything better by you than we can do to-day. It is exceedingly fortunate for this community that it has such excellent steam railroad facilities, and I do not begrudge it in the least. I am heartily glad of it, and I hope that the West End Street Railway Company may have the cordial coöperation and support of your Association and of this community in anything they may undertake to do which is reasonable toward the working out of this problem. Give us a chance to get the money, consent that the money that is invested in this be made secure, encourage people to invest their money, come to understand the question, and then you will do something toward the working out of this problem.

President Whitney's address was loudly applauded at the close, after which Mr. Lincoln moved that a vote of thanks be tendered to Mr. Whitney for his interesting talk, and the motion unanimously prevailed. Afterward a lunch was served. The whole affair was a grand success.

ADDRESS BEFORE THE ROXBURY CLUB,

MAY 9, 1891.

President Henry M. Whitney, of the West End Street Railway Company, as the guest of the Roxbury Club, Saturday night, addressed a critical, intelligent, and, if one may judge from their ultimate action, a highly appreciative and edified audience of citizens of Roxbury. Mr. Whitney was introduced by the President of the Roxbury Club, and spoke as follows:—

MR. PRESIDENT, AND GENTLEMEN OF ROXBURY:—

Something less than a year ago, forewarned by certain measures introduced into the city government of Boston, that an attempt was to be made during the coming winter to levy increased taxes upon the street railway corporations of the State, I was led to inform myself particularly and accurately as to the condition of transportation both in this country and in foreign countries.

I have spared no pains to learn what is the exact relation of this transportation question to the social life of the community. I was not aware, until I came to investigate it, how closely allied were the interests of transportation and the true interests of every community.

I found a condition of social life in the large cities of Europe which to us is absolutely appalling, and the reason for the existence of this condition of things is because it is impossible for the people to go into the suburbs, where land is cheap and houses are cheap, and avail themselves of advantages in this respect that the people in the State of Massachusetts possess.

The wages throughout Germany average for an able-bodied man from 40 to 70 cents a day; and the system of transportation throughout the whole of Germany is a single fare for perhaps a mile and a half, which is the extreme limit, 2½ cents fare. You then go perhaps a mile or a mile and a half

further, and it is $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents more ; you go another mile and a half, and it is $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents more ; so that, under the German system, if one were to start from the northern depots and go to our station in Dorchester, he would pay no less than $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents.

Now, of course, no laboring man in Europe could afford to pay 15 cents a day for his fare to and from his work, receiving only about 60 cents for his wages.

The average pay to a conductor and a driver of a horse-car in the city of Berlin and in Frankfort and all German cities is 60 cents a day. We pay from \$2 to \$2.25. Well, now, the road in Berlin has earned within the last six or eight years an average net profit of 46 per cent. a year ; and the West End Street Railway Company earned on its enormous traffic last year a net profit of but 6.2 per cent. That was all that it earned, and the road gave to the people everything but that. That was all that the West End Street Railway Company earned on its enormous traffic, carrying in this city of 400,000 or 500,000 inhabitants, as many as the city of Berlin, a city of almost 1,700,000 inhabitants. In the city of Berlin there were carried in the streetcars only as many people as were carried in the city of Boston.

What is the reason of it, and why is it that our cars are crowded ? It is simply this : the population has year by year stretched further and further into the suburbs. There are more people that live in Roxbury now than there were ten years ago ; there were more ten years ago than there were twenty years ago, and I suppose that in the next ten years there will be a like increase in population.

It costs a certain sum to run a car a mile. It has cost on the horsecar system of our road, during the months of February and March, 28 cents a mile. Now, you cannot run a horsecar five miles for the same expense that you can run a car a mile, and if your increase in population is at the end of the line, of course it costs more year by year to carry it, and of course, in order to do it at all, the cars must be more and more crowded.

Well, now, what is the relief from such a condition of

things, for that is the interesting question? Why, the relief from that condition of things can only come in one of three ways. It may come in a reduction of expenses, if that be possible. But everybody who knows anything about the condition of the labor market and the cost of grain and the cost of all those things that enter into the sum total of expenses knows that that alternative is not worthy of any consideration.

The second alternative is that the fares should be raised; and does anybody believe that that can be done? Why, that would neutralize one of the advantages of going into the suburbs. There is one other way, and one only, by which it can be done, and that is by the introduction of a cheaper system of motive power, and by the use of larger cars, and you are all witnesses to the fact that that is the system that the West End Street Railway is trying to introduce. It has spent over a million upon its power plant and electric work up to this time, and needs to spend millions more.

Now, I say the great difference in the social life of the poor people here and in Berlin, in my judgment, consists in the difference in the transportation system. If you draw a line at Dover Street, and say, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther, for a single fare," of course you invite the people to live within that limit. If you draw another line at the Roxbury postoffice, and say, "Thus far shalt thou go for two fares, and no farther," then you compel a certain number of people more to live within that limit, and that compels the crowding of the people into these particular limits.

In order to encourage people to go into the suburbs and live there and prevent the crowding of the central districts, they must be allowed to go for the same fare. Until I had investigated the subject recently I was not aware how important a consideration that is, and I believe there is nothing that equals it in importance before this community to-day.

How can you preserve this condition of things? Day by day the area around the city of Boston is becoming more and more crowded. We have absolutely reached the limit

at which we can carry people by horsecars. The expense per passenger last year was 1.3 cents per mile. That is the cost of carrying passengers, and is as cheap as the West End Street Railway Company or anybody else can do it.

Now, if you carry a passenger five miles, or, say, from the northern depots to Dorchester, which is about five miles and a half, there is absolutely no profit in carrying that passenger by horsecars. If we have to run a line of horsecars from the northern depots to that point exclusively for Dorchester passengers, the more we run the poorer we are. Therefore, the only alternative is a recourse to some cheaper system of transportation.

What do we find to be the effect of the electric system? Why, we find this: we find that, in the operation of the electric cars, the cars that run to Dorchester absolutely earn more per mile than the cars that run to the Norfolk House. The South Boston line has always been considered the banner line of the West End Railway Company, but it is not so any longer. The banner lines of the West End Railway Company are the lines that run out in this district, and the West End Railway Company, by its electric car system, moves its cars over this long distance and makes those cars pay better than the cars of the South Boston line or the Back Bay line, or any line we have, and that is the encouraging thing.

I am glad to tell you, gentlemen, that the result of the introduction of the electric system is encouraging, and I know that every man who has the good of this community at heart will rejoice in knowing that fact.

But now we are met with an entirely new condition of things. We are met with a condition of things that is absolutely full of danger to this whole community. I have in my hand a list of matters, twenty-three in number, brought before the Legislature of Massachusetts this year, relating to street railways. All sorts of attacks upon all sorts of matters, threatening the integrity and threatening the investment of this whole enterprise, and brought by men of all classes — honest men, I have no doubt, but many of them men full of

prejudice, men who are unwilling to look at the exact facts of the case, but who have a theory that the street railway companies can be taxed almost indefinitely and still have no injury done to the service.

Now, I believe that there is no subject upon which this community should be so truly jealous as any interference with the street railway system of transportation.

We were called to the Legislature of Massachusetts this year — and I have been called there every single year since I have been connected with the railroad — to fight for the existence of the road, but until this year I have not been met with any attacks that I deemed were specially dangerous. But now my heart is heavy with fear for the future of this enterprise, and I say that unless the people of this city stand up and see to it that this enterprise is not wrecked, I fear it will be wrecked.

Among others who have appeared before the Legislature, asking for new legislation, were the representatives of the Citizens' Association of the city of Boston; and their representative, Mr. Harding, appeared before the Committee on Cities, and presented a bill. I have in my hand the stenographer's report of his speech, and I would like to read to you some extracts from it in order that you may see whether or not what I say is true with reference to the danger of such attacks.

Before the Committee on Cities, on the eleventh day of March, Mr. Harding said: —

“The bill which I present has been prepared by the executive committee of the Citizens' Association, who have given the subject such care and attention as its very grave importance requires. We think we are justified in claiming, and certainly in submitting to you that these corporations and persons can well afford to contribute more largely than they now do to the expense of maintaining the city of Boston; and not only can they afford to do it, but we claim that the city ought, in justice to itself and to the other business interests of the city, to demand it, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ought to give the cities and

towns permission to do it, assuming that such permission does not now exist. For the purpose, therefore, of giving cities and towns that power, if it does not now exist, which they may exercise in a proper manner and with such safeguards as, in their discretion, each case warrants and requires, we have prepared this bill. It is more or less intimately connected with questions affecting legal rights and possibly constitutional prohibition; but I shall assume for the purposes of my discussion that the legal questions have been effectively and sufficiently disposed of by the very able opinion presented to the Committee the other day by the corporation counsel of Boston."

I want to call your attention to the fact that at this time this gentleman, Mr. Harding, expressed great confidence in the opinion and judgment and care of the corporation counsel of the city of Boston. And then, speaking of the street railway companies, he says this:—

"They have been granted their different privileges because it was, in the opinion of the communities, proper that they should exercise those privileges for the public interests; but it goes without saying that when the conditions, either of the public or of the individuals or of the corporation, change it is perfectly proper that the conditions under which those rights are exercised should also be changed, because we can see that a privilege granted ten, twenty, or thirty years ago, when the communities were small, when industries were struggling into being and needed protection, and it was for the interests of the community that they should be protected, and they were, therefore, given exclusive rights in the streets without payment, because at that time they could not afford to pay for them, and it would not have been right to ask them to pay for them" (that is the kind of logic he uses) "and if they had been required to pay for them it would have prevented the very thing that the communities wanted; therefore the fact that locations were granted some time ago without consideration and without payment does not in the slightest degree militate against the fairness and propriety of requiring that those same locations should be

paid for to-day if the conditions of the community, if the conditions of the corporations, if the conditions of the persons enjoying those privileges have so changed that their ability is greater and the propriety of requiring them to pay is greater."

What kind of business reasoning is that? Ignoring all questions of right whatsoever, the proposition is simply that when the corporations could not afford to pay for them they took them and ran them at a loss, but now that they can make something out of them we will turn around and give the State the right to tax them. Then this gentleman goes on:—

"It seems to us, after all the consideration that we have been able to give to the subject, that it is fair that the city of Boston should be allowed to throw upon the corporations using her streets a somewhat larger share of the public burdens than they have borne in the past, not for the purpose, as I beg you to bear in mind, of crippling the corporations, but simply for the purpose of equalizing the public burdens."

He proposes to make a new law. Ignoring the principle that all parties should be taxed alike, he proposes that the street railroad corporations should bear more than their ordinary share of public burdens, and then he goes on to explain his bill: "Section 1 provides that no franchise, right, privilege, or license in any street or public place in the Commonwealth shall hereafter be granted except in accordance with the terms of the bill."

Well, now, so far as new locations are concerned, the condition provided in the Citizens' Association bill and that asked for by the city of Boston were identically the same, and to those provisions the West End Company makes not the slightest objection. I beg you, gentlemen, to understand at the outset that the bill which has been presented by the Committee on Cities was not any bill asked for by the West End Railway Company. The street railway companies have asked nothing of the Legislature. They have been called up there and asked to defend themselves, and it has been

proposed to tax them wellnigh out of existence, and one of the provisions of the bill was that new locations should be subject to such terms and conditions as the board of aldermen should prescribe.

Well, now, so far as that is concerned, the West End Railway Company has not the slightest objection to it. If it is not in the interest of the community that these lines shall be extended, the West End Company will not object. We have not put any money into it, and that may be left to the people in the different localities. I believe it is contrary to a wise public policy, but if the powers that be have a desire that such a thing should be incorporated into the law of Massachusetts, I have not a word to say, because we have no money invested in it, we have not taken it under the belief that the good faith of the State were pledged to the acceptance. That question would come up when new locations are granted, and they make new terms, and we can then take it or not, as we can afford to, and therefore I make no sort of objection to that condition.

Section 4 of the bill, as he says, provides that "The city council or the aldermen or the selectmen, as the case may be, shall hear the petitioners and remonstrants." I will read the whole of it:—

"We conceive it to be the privilege and the right of city councils or of selectmen to determine the broad legislative question of whether or not the public interests or convenience require that certain privileges should be granted in the streets; whether the streets should be used for certain purposes or not. If they so determine, that settles the question so far as the right of the petitioner to have the privilege is concerned, provided the terms can be agreed upon between them. We give, in other words, to the city council and selectmen that power which it seems to us they ought to have, as representatives of the people, to determine the broad question whether or not these privileges are needed, and, if they are needed, then the bill goes on to say that the city council, in the case of cities, shall certify their determination to the mayor, and add such recommendations as to

the terms and conditions, including compensation, as they shall deem reasonable and proper. But those recommendations, you will observe, are not binding; they are merely recommendations; they go to his honor the mayor with such force and effect as they may be entitled to. The bill then places upon the mayor the burden, in view of the suggestions of the council and of all other material facts, of making a lease with the petitioner. There, gentlemen, is the power given, as it seems to us it should be, to the chief executive officer of this city to make this contract with the petitioner."

That leaves the whole matter to the mayor, and to that I make no objection. I merely call your attention to the fact that at this time Mr. Harding, representing the Citizens' Association, desired to leave the matter to the city council and the mayor, and was perfectly willing, in behalf of the Association, that any terms and conditions that the mayor might see fit to impose, with the veto power of the railroad commissioners, was satisfactory to the Association which he represented.

He says, in speaking of the new regulation, "Therefore as a matter of law I deem it would be proper, just, and constitutional for the Legislature to say, 'The cities and towns may tax as they choose existing locations without waiting for their termination or without revoking them.'"

If I understand Mr. Harding's position, it is that it would have been indiscreet in the outset to have allowed the local authorities to impose special taxes upon street railways, because that course would have prevented investment in this important enterprise, but that, after the investment has been made and cannot be recalled, it is not only legal and constitutional, but just and reasonable, to allow the local authorities to impose such burdens as they see fit, and in that monstrous doctrine, which is nothing less than confiscation, he has claimed to be representing the Citizens' Association of Boston. Mr. Harding goes on: —

"In other words, gentlemen, if cities and towns, in granting these existing licenses, locations, and privileges, have not

reserved to themselves any right to terminate in terms these locations or rights, or if the statute law of the Commonwealth has not provided that they shall be terminable upon conditions, then it seems to us that those gentlemen exercising these privileges have what is, in effect, a certain vested right; although I submit, as a matter of law — I think there is no question about the propriety of it — I submit as a matter of law that the Legislature would have authority to engraft upon existing locations, as the implied condition which was annexed to them at the time they were granted, that they should be subject at all times to such reasonable regulations as might be imposed in the interests of the public. Therefore as matter of law I deem that it would be proper, just, and constitutional for the Legislature to say: ‘The cities and towns may tax as they choose existing locations without awaiting for their termination or without revoking them.’ ”

That is, if any corporation in this State, running a street railway, has a location which is by its terms irrevocable, he wants the Legislature of Massachusetts to pass such laws as will make it legal and just and constitutional, in his view, to step in and say that, notwithstanding all that, we will take these rights away from you, and then we will give them to you for a limited term, and that is a great deal better for you.

Then he goes on, speaking for the executive committee of this Citizens’ Association : —

“ We have given this subject such consideration as we could, and that is the opinion which has been arrived at by our executive committee. If it seems to be not sufficiently broad, we can simply submit the matter to the Committee, and we are entirely content to adopt any amendment or change which the wisdom of the Committee may dictate.”

Section 5 of his bill referred to existing locations, and Senator West asked him, “ But according to your bill you exempt corporations now in existence. That is, you do not exact any rental from any corporation now existing, as I understand it.”

“ Unless,” Mr. Harding says in reply, “ the boards of alder-

men see fit to avail themselves of their right to terminate a location, in which case they can make a new lease on a new basis."

Mr. Harding, now representing the Citizens' Association, finds very great objection to the bill reported by the Committee on Cities, and wants it referred to the rapid transit commission. Mr. Harding said at this time, March 11, "If the bill does not strike the Committee as fair in that respect, then it is subject to amendment. We should be happy to have the Committee amend it in any way they choose."

Referring again to the bill that he proposes, he says, "I want to say that we do not submit this bill as an ultimatum — take it or leave it; we only present it as the result of our deliberations and conclusions. Any changes or amendments that you think proper to make we shall be very happy to accept." Then the question was asked by Mr. Kittredge, whether or not this might not embarrass the corporation, whether the proposition of the board of aldermen to take away a location on Tremont Street or on Washington Street might not embarrass this corporation or incommode the people.

Mr. Harding says: "If that contingency should occur, the people who suffer from it, the people who do not receive so good accommodations as they did before, are the very people who are imposing the exactions which prevent their getting suitable accommodations.

"Now, then, if the people of Boston find that they are getting poorer accommodations, if they are satisfied that the West End road is doing all it can in good faith, what will be the result? Why, the next board of aldermen, the next city council, will be elected upon the very issue of repealing that contract and receding from the position which the city has taken. And it can do that whenever it chooses. In other words, whenever the public demand is so strong in favor of the corporation, that contract will be wiped out of existence just as soon as the city council can meet; so that the trouble will redress itself."

Why, that condition of things would compel the corpora-

tion to be in politics every day of the year. He says, of course, that would be the result. He proposes to make the city elections turn on this very thing; this man who was so horrified by the suggestion of corruption of the city council or any other body.

He says here the elections would turn upon the subject, and you must wait until all these things occur, until you are deprived of the accommodations, until the company is embarrassed and cannot go on — you must wait for all these things, and then you must have an election upon this very principle of changing this condition. And how long, I pray you, may it be left changed?

When questioned as to what would be the probable effect upon the railroad company of such a condition of things as he has been describing, he says: "Take Washington Street to-day. To-day it is used for nothing. Suppose the city council, after this bill is passed, should conclude the corporations using it ought to pay something to the city. What will be done? These gentlemen would not be told to rip up their tracks and leave town. We do not want to have the cars removed from Washington Street; it would not do. But the city council, in conference with the mayor, whichever chose to take the initiative, they would say: 'Is it not right that that corporation should pay something for the use of that location, and, if so, how much, and what should be the terms?' And the council can make such recommendations as they choose to the mayor, and the mayor can determine in his own mind what he wants to do."

There is n't any law about it. There is no protection about it. The city council can charge whatever they choose, or the mayor can fix whatever he chooses. He says of the mayor: "He can then summon the horsecar people and tell them what is proposed to do" — a very gracious thing to do — "a lease will be given, or, rather, to put it differently, make the lease itself covering the location; and then let the council pass an order revoking the location, and have the two things simultaneous" — a most beautiful condition.

He provides a way by which, before the location is revoked, they will come to the horsecar people and say: "Here, we propose to tax you so much; it does n't make any difference whether you can pay it, or whether before you can pay it you have got to take the cars off the Franklin Park and Grove Hall lines, you have got to pay that tax;" and then the railroad company may say half a loaf is better than no bread, and they will have to pay; all they have got to do is to revoke the location and say, "We will give you the new track on whatever terms we choose." And he goes on: "And that location takes effect upon the execution of the lease, so that practically the city or town is not obliged to wait until the corporations come and say: 'Tax us upon this thing,' but they will take the initiative, I should suppose, and they will say that, wherever they have a proper and existing location, they shall pay something. It will be a matter of bargain and agreement with the corporation, and it will be brought about in that way by the execution of the lease and revocation of the existing location; so the things will lap right on to one another."

What a beautiful condition of things that will be! You have got a most beautiful piece of mosaic, in which the whole system may be upset, by which the city council may take the corporation by the throat and say, "Pay this, or you shall die."

Now, then, I would like to ask any gentleman here whether, if he were the manager of the West End Railway Corporation, he would look cheerfully upon a proposition coming at such a time and coming from such a source? The West End Railway Company is proposing, if it can be secured in its rights, to spend millions of dollars in perfecting this service, and here is a bill that will not only absolutely prevent that, but will stop all progress in every direction.

Now, then, what have the Committee on Cities, who heard this argument, and heard the city of Boston and its argument, done? I say that the present city government of Boston is not responsible for initiating this movement.

There was a very general belief throughout the Commonwealth that the street railway companies could afford to pay a larger tax, and that opinion was honestly held by great numbers of people, and this question was heard before the Committee. When they came to look this question fairly and squarely in the face, they found that they were dealing with a subject broader and deeper than it was previously believed to be, and presented the bill, which has been criticized by Mr. Harding and his associates. Was there anything heard during all these four months that the bills were before this Committee about referring the question to a commission? Not a single word. Did Mr. Harding ever object to this tribunal? Did any member of the Citizens' Association or anybody else ever object to trying this question before the tribunal until after the verdict was rendered? Not a single one. It was never lisped anywhere that this was not a competent tribunal; and the commission appointed on rapid transit has nothing more to do with the surface system than it has to do with the steam railroads.

The bill itself provides that it shall deal solely with the question of rapid transit, and now what does this Citizens' Association have to say about it?

Why, because the Committee have taken Mr. Harding at his word, and acted under the gracious permission that he gave them, and have amended his bill in some particulars, and made it so that the corporation can live under it, what do they say? Why, they are endeavoring to impeach the tribunal. And what do they say in reference to it? They make objections, and, fortunately for us, they have given their reasons: "Because the provisions of the bill are absolutely the same for all the cities and towns of the Commonwealth having street railroads." Well, here is the bill, and I will read the first section: —

"Every street railway company shall pay a tax on its real estate, wires, poles, horses, cars, equipment, and machinery, and every street railway company having preferred stock"—and there is n't but one of them in the State—"shall pay a further tax on its rails, sleepers, and other tangible property."

Is n't there any difference? Why, the tracks of the West End Street Railway Company are assessed at nearly \$5,000,000, and the West End Street Railway Company is taxed legally upon that, and every other street railway in the State is exempt from that.

The next objection is: "Because the rights and locations of street railroad companies, granted and accepted subject to change, are converted, without certain and adequate compensation, into vested property which even future Legislatures cannot change or affect for thirty years without indemnity being made to the corporations." This is absolutely false. The bill pending says: —

"But all obligations, liabilities, provisions, restrictions, regulations, or conditions heretofore made or existing, or which may hereafter be made, relating to the granting, altering, or revoking of any location, or for the construction or use of any track, cars, wire, pole, posts, or other structure in, over, or under any public way or place, or relative to the opening, occupation, or use of, or keeping in repair or in order, any street, by any such corporation, shall be and continue in full force and unaffected by this act."

What is the third reason? "Because, if the settled policy of the Commonwealth is to be changed, the compensation to be paid therefor ought to be both certain and adequate."

Well, in whose judgment shall it be "certain and adequate"? Shall it be in the judgment of the city of Boston, who have assented to the bill in its main features? Shall it be left to the executive committee of the Citizens' Association to say, or shall it be left so that the service shall be the measure of adequate compensation?

I say that it ought to come back to that in the end; that the money that the corporation receives should be used as far as possible in improving the service, and not paying new taxes. That is in the line of true public policy, whatever may be said against it. The business of a street railway corporation is to give the best service it can afford to give, and the sixth section of this bill gives the railroad commissioners authority to enforce such service.

The next reason is: "Because the tendency of the bill will be to prevent, for thirty years, all change and improvement in the existing method and means of street railway transportation, any extension of lines and routes by existing companies, as well as any competition by new companies, and any reduction of the fares as now established throughout the Commonwealth."

So far from that, the law is left exactly as it is to-day. Fares can be reduced exactly as they can be to-day. There is not a single change in this bill affecting that provision. "Any fifty legal voters of a city or town who may be aggrieved by the service rendered by such corporation operating a street railway company may apply to the board of railroad commissioners, and they shall hear it," and they shall decide whether or not the service shall be improved, and in addition to that, instead of providing the same provisions now in force for the improvement of the service, it is provided that any fifty legal voters, on application to the town, may compel the street railway company to put in new locations.

There is no such thing in the present law. That is an additional duty which the city of Boston has insisted on putting into this bill, and thus it provides for the building of new locations, whether the corporation will or no, upon the judgment of the railroad commissioners that it should be done, and there is precisely the same provision in the law with reference to the fares that exist in the statutes to-day. And what is the next point?

"Because it is unwise to pass any further law affecting the use of the streets of Boston for the transportation of passengers, until the whole subject of such transportation shall have been maturely considered and reported upon by a commission appointed for that purpose."

There is no commission appointed for that purpose. The rapid transit commission has not the first thing to do on this, and this Committee on Cities has been listening to this thing for upward of four months.

Next they say, "Because, if the bill becomes a law, the

recommendations of the rapid transit commission cannot be adopted by Boston or enforced by the next Legislature without making full indemnity to the West End Railway Company for any disturbance with its existing system caused thereby."

Here is section 9 of the bill: "Nothing in this act shall apply to any elevated or underground railway or track, or shall affect any provision of law now existing or hereafter made relating to any such railway or track."

Now, the amazing thing is that the Citizens' Association should sign any such protest as that. They have not intended to lie about it, they have not intended to state what was not true, but there is absolutely hardly a single thing in that whole protest that is true. The only excuse for these gentlemen is that they did not know it and they do not know it.

There is hardly a single thing reported upon by the Committee on Cities that changes the existing law on the street railways one single particle, except it says that no new burden shall be imposed for a term of thirty years. Everything else remains substantially as it is to-day, except that the burdens and duties of the corporations are materially increased.

And now I leave it to you, gentlemen, whether or not this is a serious condition. I say that unless the West End Street Railway Company can be secured in its rights and privileges it can do nothing more. It must stop, and it will stop. If the Legislature decides to have us wait until some commission shall be appointed, who shall determine how we shall hold these rights, then we must be content, because we cannot do otherwise. But, in this event, further developments of the electric system must stop.

The only way in which the West End Street Railway can ever hope to do anything with reference to the rapid transit problem is in the saving it may make by the introduction of the electric system. Leave the railway company without any protection whatsoever, then the thing cannot be done at all. So far as the West End Street Railway Company is

concerned, it will have no proposition whatsoever to make with reference to the underground or elevated railway.

We have the right to build an underground road, and last year we were given the right to build an elevated railway, and I was then sanguine that, with the introduction of the electric system, we might feel able to tackle that problem; but, if we have no security for our investment, we cannot do it, and we shall not, under such circumstances, try to do it.

If the Legislature is not willing to make the investments in street railways secure, then the West End Street Railway is done. If the surface system is developed, it must be done in accordance with the laws of trade; and the very first and fundamental law of trade is that the investment shall be made secure.

Now, it is not a question which any citizen of Boston can afford to pass by and consider of little importance. It is a thing of the very greatest importance, and the danger is now that the expression of opinion by a body like the Citizens' Association, who are entirely misinformed upon the bill, and who do not appreciate the seriousness of the situation, may so far influence the Legislature as to prevent them from doing what they know to be right.

I cannot fight this battle alone much longer, and I do not intend to. I have spent four months of my time in constant attendance upon the Legislature, in constant care and thought upon this question. I am interested in it. I know that the welfare of this community is bound up in this transportation question, and I have done all that I could do, in fidelity not only to my stockholders, but to this community, in endeavoring to solve this problem, but I can do nothing more, unless you and the Legislature and the people of Massachusetts are willing that the investments that go into this enterprise shall be made secure. If they are not made secure, then of course we must stop, whatever are the consequences.

After the applause which Mr. Whitney's address elicited had subsided, Colonel R. S. Rockwell offered the following resolution:—

“Resolved, that the residents of Roxbury appreciate the efforts of the West End Railway, under its present management, to improve its service and to render it more nearly adequate to the public requirements, and they look with disfavor upon any change of Legislative policy which will tend to hamper the railway corporation. On the other hand, they believe the bill reported by the Committee on Cities, and now pending, relating to the taxes on property and franchises of street railway corporations, is not only just to the corporations, but is in the true line of the public interest.”

General John L. Swift seconded the motion for the adoption of the resolution. Mr. Paul Kendrick and others spoke in its favor, and it was unanimously adopted.

[illegible]